



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

880.9

C458

A 468839

THE GREEK ORATORS CONSIDERED AS
HISTORICAL AUTHORITIES.

THE ARNOLD PRIZE ESSAY FOR 1866.

BY

FRANCIS ALLSTON CHANNING, B.A.,

LATE SCHOLAR OF EXETER COLLEGE.



"Historia vero testis temporum, lux veritatis, vita memoris, magistra vitæ,
nuntia vetustatis, qua voce alia, nisi oratoria, immortalitati commendatur?"

CICERO. *De Oratore* II. 9.

"Quoniam quidem concessum est rhetoribus ementiri in historiis, ut aliquid
dicere possint argutius."—CICERO. *Brutus*, xi. 42.

OXFORD:

T. & G. SHRIMPTON, BROAD STREET.

MDCCLXVI.



THE GREEK ORATORS CONSIDERED AS
HISTORICAL AUTHORITIES.

THE ARNOLD PRIZE ESSAY FOR 1866.

BY

FRANCIS ALLSTON CHANNING, *Baron* B.A.,

LATE SCHOLAR OF EXETER COLLEGE.



"Historia vero testis temporum, lux veritatis, vita memoriæ magistra vitæ
nuntia vetustatis, qua voce alia, nisi oratoris, immortalitati commendatur?"

CICERO. *De Oratore* II. 9.

"Quoniam quidem concessum est rhetoribus ementiri in historiis, ut aliquid
dicere possint argutius."—CICERO. *Brutus*, xi. 42.

OXFORD:

T. & G. SHRIMPTON, BROAD STREET.

MDCCCLXVI.

170.4
C458

nd

Sub.
Black,
3-7-41
42314

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
I. GENERAL RELATIONS OF THE ORATOR TO HISTORICAL FACTS	1
II. SOURCES AND CONDITIONS OF GREEK ORATORY. . . .	6
III. THE GREEK ORATORS.	16
IV. POINTS OF HISTORY ILLUSTRATED BY THE ORATORS . .	27
V. CONDITIONS AND WORTH OF THE HISTORICAL AUTHORITY OF THE ORATORS	50

THE GREEK ORATORS CONSIDERED AS HISTORICAL AUTHORITIES.

AN ancient writer has said that history is a subject peculiarly suited to the orator, and the fact that the writer was himself a great orator gives weight to his opinion.* If history is to be something more than a simple record of actions and events, if it is to give not only events but causes, not only actions but motives, there are two qualities necessary for the historian. He must have an intellect sagacious and comprehensive to select the facts and to group them in their true relations. Again, he must be keenly sensible to the varied play of human feelings and human motives to appreciate and express the moral bearings of human actions and events. But these are just the qualities that a good orator possesses. He chooses and arranges his facts so as to bring out their meaning in the conclusion which is the object of

* Cicero, *De Legibus*, I. ii. 5. Opus unum hoc oratorium maxime. Cf. *De Oratore*, II. xii. 51, seq.

his speech. And in both choice and arrangement of matter he is guided by the sympathies of his hearers, who, if they are to be persuaded, must be made to feel the whole as well as the parts.

Such an analogy between the qualities needed for history and for oratory, may be of use in estimating the historical value of the statements of orators, though it obviously cannot be pressed far. Practically, the orator differs from the historian both in matter and in treatment. Facts of history are only a part of the matter of oratory. The acts and circumstances of individuals, and the technicalities of law, are as much facts for the orator as military movements and constitutional or social changes. If the historian and the orator are compared in the treatment of what they have in common, it may be said that the object of the historian is to state with accuracy and clearness the facts, their causes, and their consequences; the object of the orator is so to group and colour the facts as to make his hearers think and feel and act in a certain manner. Thus facts are acceptable to the historian because they are true, to the orator because they are useful.^b Both history and oratory present the facts as a connected whole. But the connexion given by history is drawn from the facts themselves; the connection given by oratory depends on the point which the facts are adduced to prove or carry.^c

The historical value of statements of fact in an

^b Dion. Halic. *Ars Rhet.* p. 392. Reiske, ἀγὰρ ὃ δυνάμει μάλιστα
αὐτὸς τὸν λόγον.

^c Id. ib. p. 388.

oration will thus depend on the aim of the oration, as well as on the powers and character of the orator. Facts brought forward to carry a great decision of national policy, where many interests join or clash in earnest debate, will be worth more than if the aim is to gratify the light-hearted multitude at a public festival, or to establish private rights or satisfy private enmities in courts of justice.

Again, the treatment of the facts will depend on the temper and the experience of the audience. The great check which is imposed on all statements whether of orators or historians, is the standard of probability. By such a standard all that is meant is conformity with experience. What is improbable is what has not been experienced, or what is unlike what has been experienced. Such a check operates more stringently on the historian, because his statements have to meet the careful study of thoughtful and experienced readers. The orator, on the other hand, has only to satisfy hearers for the moment. Inaccuracies may easily escape observation, or if they are observed they may be carried off by the point of the argument.⁴ Still he is responsible. He cannot venture wholly to misrepresent a fact well known to his hearers; and in stating facts slightly known or even unknown to them he must reconcile his statements with known facts, and the inferences derived from them, thus producing a connection closely corresponding to that of history.*

⁴ Cicero, *Brut.* c. xii. § 42.

* Arist. *Rhet.* I. i. § 6. αὐτὰ τὰ ἀληθῆ καὶ τὰ βελτίον τῇ φύσει ἐνυλλογιστότερα καὶ πιθανώτερα, ὥς ἀπλῶς εἰπῶν.

The orator, then, is obliged to conform to the experience and the reason, as well as to the taste of his audience; the facts he states must be probable if they are to persuade. Thus the knowledge and the character of those addressed will be an important condition of the worth of historical statements made before them.

The truth of his facts is the first aim of the historian; in the case of the orator, the truth or even the probability of the facts is only a necessary condition of attaining the main object, which is the persuasion of the audience. The historian is directly and permanently responsible for his veracity, the responsibility of the orator is indirect and temporary. On the one hand, then, the fact that he has not to address the prejudices and passions of the moment gives still greater weight to the authority of the historian. On the other hand, where the words of the orator are measured at once by the experience of men whose attention is quickened by deep personal interest, and who are responsibly discussing a matter of practical importance, the facts may be more truthfully as well as more vividly stated, than in subsequent historical narration. This was probably one of the reasons for the insertion of speeches by the ancient historians.

Facts given in orations may be stated with or without proofs. They may be proved by the production of eye-witnesses or authentic documents, and, in this case, they have the highest historical value. For original testimony is the highest form of historical evidence. Again, they may not be proved, but stated

on the authority of the orator, or as being well known to his audience. In this case, the intellectual and moral character of the orator, and the object to which the facts are applied, will go to determine their historical worth. But the ultimate measure of authenticity must be the degree in which the experience, the memory, and the sentiment of the audience conform to historical truth. For the treatment of the facts must be a result of the standard to which alone the orator is responsible. If his hearers are men of wide experience, keen intellect, and sober feeling, the statements of the orator will be clear and accurate. If, on the other hand, historical records are scanty and little known, if popular experience is confined to oral tradition, if there is a keen sensibility to beauty of expression and novelty of arrangement, precision in matters of fact will not be required of the orator.

The authority of the orator in matters of history is thus practically limited to contemporary events. For these alone can be proved by the production of original testimony, or by an appeal to the personal experience of the hearers, while still fresh in their memory.

It may at first seem the easiest test of the historical authority of orators to compare their statements with the corresponding statements of historians of the same time. Where the fact of the orator and the fact of the historian are identical or necessarily connected, such a test is applicable, and is of the greatest use from the different treatment and different object of the historian. But even where the orator and the historian are speaking of the same facts, the point given by the one may

neither imply nor be inconsistent with the point given by the other.

And, again, the same facts may be stated by a contemporary orator and a subsequent historian. If the statements of the latter are based on original testimony, they may fairly be used to shew the truth or falsehood of the orator. But if they cannot be raised to the level of contemporary authority, the orator must be judged by other tests. Once more, there may be many facts and series of facts given by orators only. On the whole, then, the worth of historical statements in speeches must, in most cases, be measured by other standards than the statements of historians. Such standards can only be obtained by a careful examination of oratory itself and its relations to fact, as they are determined by the character of the orator and the temper of the audience.

To apply this general result to the present question : if the authority of the Greek orators in matters of history is to be fairly estimated, it will be as well to trace briefly the conditions under which Greek oratory was developed and exercised, and those points in the character and circumstances of the several orators on which their treatment of facts depended.

Public speaking is natural to all free communities,^f and it is probable that it reached some degree of excellence in most of the Greek states. Sicily, certainly, was the first to make eloquence an art. But the

^f Cf. Sophocles, *Œd. Col.* v. 66. *ἄρχη τις αὐτῶν ἥ' ἐστὶ πολλὰ πλάθου λόγους*; Eurip. *Phæn.* v. 401 (among the woes of exile) *ἐν μὲν μίγιστον, οὐκ ἔχουσιν παρερησίαν*. and Pindar speaks of a democracy as *ἰ λῆβρος σφράγους* (Pyth. ii. v. 160).

oratory with which we are concerned is that of Athens. The Attic orators are the only Greek orators,[§] as well from their superiority as from the fact that their speeches alone have been preserved.

The practical guarantee which Solon wished for his reorganization of the Athenian state, was that each citizen should discharge in person all duties of his citizenship.^h He must speak as well as fight,ⁱ he must live and act in the assembly and in the court as well as in battle and at sea. Whether Solon was its author or not, this principle was the best expression of Athenian democracy, as it was the chief cause of Athenian greatness.^j And it was the source of most that was peculiar in Athenian oratory. For it was the basis of the relation in which the speaker stood to those whom he addressed.

Such a principle largely influenced the mental and moral atmosphere of Athens; but, practically, the natural inequality of men, and political necessities, prevented it from being fully carried out. The struggle against Persia, and the effort to win and keep empire over Greece, brought great men forward

§ Cicero, *Brut.* c. 13. Hoc autem studium non erat commune Græciæ, sed proprium Athenarum. Quis enim aut Argivum oratorem aut Corinthium aut Thebanum scit fuisse temporibus illis? Lacedæmonium vero usque ad hoc tempus audiivi fuisse neminem.

^h Cf. Plutarch, *Vit. Sol.* c. xviii. seqq.

ⁱ Arist. *Rhet.* I. i. 12. ἄριστον, εἰ τῷ σώματι μὴν αἰσχερὸν μὴ δύνασθαι βοηθεῖν ἑαυτῷ, λόγῳ δ' οὐκ αἰσχερὸν, ὃ μᾶλλον ἰδίῳ ἵσται ἀνθρώπου τῆς τοῦ σώματος χρείας. Cf. also Plato, *Gorgias*, p. 486, B. and Thucyd. ii. 40. τὸν μὲν δὲ τῶνδε μισέχοντα π. σ. λ.

^j Herodot. v. 78. 'Ἀθηναῖοι μὲν νυν ᾗδξαντο' δηλαὴ δὲ οὐ κατ' ἴν μοῦνον, ἀλλὰ πανταχῇ, ἣ ἰσηγορίῃ ὡς ἴσται χρεῖμα σπουδαῖον ἰλιθιερμένον δὲ αὐτοῖς ἱκανοὶ ἑαυτῷ περιουσίῃ κατιεργάζεσθαι.

as leaders not only in war but in counsel. They were men who looked deeply into the causes of Athenian strength or weakness, who formed lofty conceptions of Athenian destiny, who were equally sagacious in divining, and vigorous in executing, what was best for Athens. But it was their eloquence as well as their wisdom and their energy that gave them the lead. Every measure had to be fully discussed in the public assembly before men who, in theory, were equal, and who, in practice, were severe critics of the suggestions of others, even where they suggested nothing themselves.^k Clear statement and persuasive argument were therefore indispensable to political ascendancy.^l Accordingly, the speeches of the early Athenian statesmen were distinguished by wide views and forcible applications, expressed with a noble simplicity and a pregnant brevity^m well suited to their shrewd and earnest audience. Such men were Themistocles,ⁿ Cimon, Thucydides,^o Ephialtes, and above all Pericles.^p It is to be regretted that none of their political speeches have been preserved in writing. They could not have failed to throw light on the events of the period in

^k Thucyd. ii. 40. αὐτοὶ ἦσαν κρείσσειν γὰρ ἢ ἰνδυμούμεθα ἐρῶς τὰ πράγματα κ. τ. λ.

^l There is a beautiful passage in Hesiod's *Theogony* (v. 78, seq.) in which the power of kings over their peoples is referred to persuasive speech, the gift of Calliope, best of all the Muses.

^m Cicero, *De Orat.* ii. 22. Subtiles, acuti, breves, sententiis magis quam verbis abundantes.

ⁿ Thucyd. i. 138. ἃ μετὰ χεῖρας ἔχου καὶ ἐξηγήσασθαι οἷος εἶ. Lys. *Epiot.* xlii. ἱκανώτατος ἡγεῖν καὶ γινῶναι καὶ πράττειν.

^o The son of Melesias. Cf. Plutarch, *Pericles*, c. 11, 14, etc.

^p Plato, *Phædr.* p. 269, E. 270... ὁ Περικλῆς πάντων τελειώτατος εἰς τὴν ρητορικὴν ... τὸ ἐψηλόειν τοῦτο καὶ πάντῃ τελειογενὲς... ὁ καὶ Περικλῆς πρὸς τῷ εὐφροὺς εἶναι ἐκτέλειτο κ. τ. λ.

which Athenian power reached its height—a period which has now to be reproduced from the meagre details of later historians, from the common-places of later orators, and by inferences from subsequent events.¹

We are concerned with the early statesmen-orators, then, only as they affected the speakers and the audience of a later age. This they did in several ways. In the first place their eloquence—the result rather of their natural powers and the times in which they lived, than of study and art—became the model of all political oratory at Athens.² Nearly a century after, when Demosthenes first failed before the assembly, he was reassured by an aged citizen comparing the speech to what he remembered of Pericles.³ The severity of their style, and the soundness of their principles, were often contrasted with the affected graces and charlatanry of later demagogues.⁴ Again, the assembly was accustomed to a comprehensive and searching discussion of political questions, and thus the standard of thought and expression, which it was necessary for orators to attain, if they wished to succeed, became very high. The power which Pericles and leading Athenians before him gained by their oratory, made other men ambitious for political influence who could not employ the same means. Incapable of commanding those whom they addressed, by force of character

¹ Dion. Hal. (*Antiq. Rom.* vii. 66) dwells on the importance of the preservation of speeches for understanding great political movements.

² Cicero (*De Or.* II. 22), speaking of Critias, Theramenes, Lysias, &c., says, “Omnes etiam tum retinebant illum Pericli succum.”

³ Plut. *Dem.* c. 4, 9.

⁴ Cf. Æschin. *C. Timarch.* p. 52, § 25. Demosth. *Olynth.* iii. p. 34, § 21, 22. N.B.—The references have been made to the pages of Reiske, and to the sections of the *Oratores Attici* of Baiter and Sauppe.

or originality of views, they took their principles from the temper of their audience.* The graver charges brought against the demagogues at the time of the Peloponnesian war by Thucydides and Aristophanes may or may not be true. These men may have been sincere in their democratic professions, or they may have been corrupt and unscrupulous adventurers.† But what is tolerably certain, and what it is most important here to notice, is, that they were narrow and hasty in opinion, and vehement in party feeling, and that, consequently, they diminished the strength and soundness of political judgment, and gave intensity to social prejudices. The temper thus produced in the assembly made a certain amount of flattery and deception necessary, even in those speakers who had the good of the country most at heart.‡

We have thus reviewed the oratory of the early statesmen, and some of its effects, direct and indirect, on speakers and hearers of the succeeding age at Athens.

The other source of the later Attic oratory was the rhetoric of the sophists. An estimate of the sophists is foreign to our purpose. They only concern us so far as their method of thought and study of expression influenced the treatment of facts by the orators.

It must be observed that artificial rhetoric was first

* Thuc. ii. 65. οἱ δὲ ὑστερον ἴσται αὐτοὶ μᾶλλον πρὸς ἀλλήλους ὄντες, ἐγράπτοντο καθ' ἑδονὰς τῇ δόμῃ καὶ τὰ ἀράγματα ἰδιώδεις. Cf. also Demosth. *Olynth.* iii. § 22.

† Æschines, *C. Ctes.* c. 79. Lysias, *De Affect. Tyr.* § 19. Thucyd. ii. 65.

‡ Thuc. iii. 43. (δι') ἐν τῷ ἀμείνω λίγοντα ψινδόμενοι πιστεῖν γινίσκται.

Cf. Andocid. *De Pace*, § 33. οὐδὲς πώποτε ἐν δῆμον τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἐκ τοῦ παντὸς πείσας ἴσμεν, ἀλλὰ δι' ἐλατύντας ἢ ἐξασπασθέντας αὐτὸν εὖ καὶ ἴσμεν.

developed by the extensive litigation at Syracuse after the fall of the Gelonian dynasty.* Its original object was not to give expression to political principles, nor even to win influence for the ambitious, but to further private interests. The rules to which Corax and Tisias reduced the art of persuasion, were combined by Gorgias of Leontini with the principles of negative philosophy. The object of the orator was not truth, for there was no such thing as truth. He need not convince his audience, but only persuade them. As to the means of persuasion, he must handle common-places dexterously, and reduce the position of his opponent to absurdity by jests or sophisms.† The subject-matter was therefore of no importance. Accurate knowledge and careful statement were not necessary to the rhetorician, who won attention by artificial antitheses,‡ while he charmed the ear with the ring of his words and the rhythm of his sentences,§ and the eye with the grace of his gestures. Once master of his art, he was ready for all subjects, and for all occasions.¶

Introduced by Gorgias to Athens, on his visit as ambassador from Léontini, the novelty and beauty of the Sicilian rhetoric at once won approval. Orations

* Cicero, *Brut.* xii. "Cum sublati in Sicilia tyrannis res privatae longo intervallo judiciis repeterentur." So also id. l. c. "acuta illa gens (Siculorum) et controversa natura."

† Arist. *Rhet.* III. xviii. 7. διὺν τὴν μὲν σπουδὴν διαφθεῖρει τῶν ἰσχυρίων γίλῳτι, τὴν δὲ γίλῳτα σπουδῇ.

‡ As to antithesis v. [Arist.] *Rhet. ad Alex.* c. 27.

§ The ἰσχυρά, ἰμιοσιλίῳτα, πῶρεα, παροισμασίαι, παρηχέαι, κ. τ. λ.

¶ Arist. *Rhet.* III. xvii. 11.

on general themes, as displays of rhetorical skill, were delivered in all parts of Greece, and schools of rhetoric were soon established.

The sound sense and the exact taste of Athens, and the practical requirements of the Pnyx and the Heliaea, rapidly modified the matter and the diction of rhetoric. Still its effects on the Athenians as an audience were very remarkable. They learned to give attention to the skill as well as to the truth of the orator, to the subtlety of thought and to the flow of language as well as to the practical worth of what was said. An oration came to be estimated as it was a source of pleasure, and not merely as it accurately exposed facts or enforced useful measures.^c

Some incidental results of the rhetorical teaching are important to notice.

The rhetorician undertook to prepare his pupils for public life, and public life at Athens meant speaking with effect in the assembly and in the courts.^d To ensure success it was necessary, as has been said before, to reach a standard by no means low. Owing, then, to this necessity, and the inequality of natural abilities, it was an easy transition for the teacher first to help his pupils in the preparation of their speeches, and next to write speeches for pupils or clients, which they got by heart and delivered.^e This practice became

^c Cf. Cleon's description of an Athenian audience; though evidently exaggerated, it probably was true in the main. Thucyd. iii. 38. Cf. also Arist. *Rhet.* III. i. 5.

^d Aristoph. *Nub.* 413. *ὡς ἂν πρέσβων καὶ βουλευόντων καὶ τῇ γλώττῃ πολιμίζων.*

^e Cf. the ludicrous account of the citizen "getting up" his speech for his *δυσῖδιον*. Aristoph. *Equit.* 332, seq.

universal in judicial oratory, and to some extent in political oratory also.^f The writing of speeches for fees was contrary to Athenian feeling, and was distinctly forbidden by the laws.^g Æschines cast it as a reproach against Demosthenes,^h and the austere Lycurgus makes it the subject of bitter censure.ⁱ But it was evidently a necessity of Athenian institutions. Advocates, in the modern sense, were not allowed.^j At the most a near relative or friend was sometimes permitted to make the second speech in the case.^k Of this the most striking instance is the Oration on the Crown, where Demosthenes speaks not as an advocate, but as a friend.

The anomaly that immediately results is that the orator is the man who wrote, not the man who spoke. Of about one hundred and ten judicial orations preserved, ten only appear to have been spoken by the orators themselves, and those only where the orator was speak-

^f Thuc. viii. 68 (Antiphon). *αὐτὸς μίνας ἄγων, ζομίλους καὶ ἐν δικαστηρίῳ καὶ ἐν δήμῳ πλείοντα εἰς ἀκήρ, ὅστις συμβουλεύσασαί τι, δυνάμειος ὠφελίῳ.* There is a fragmentary oration of Lysias (*Or.* xxxiv.) which seems to have been written for some one to deliver before the assembly. At least Lysias himself could not have delivered it.

^g Lycurgus, *C. Leocr.* § 138. Deinarchus, *C. Demosth.* § 110.

^h *C. Timarch.* *C. Ctes.* § 173.

ⁱ *C. Leocr.* § 138.

^j On the principle given above (p. 7). There are two lost speeches of Hyperides in which he acted as an advocate—the defence of an Athenian athlete before the Hellenodiceæ at Olympia, and the defence of Phryne. And if we may trust Æschines (*De Falsa Leg.* § 14), Demosthenes acted as advocate for Philocrates, *when the latter was ill.* Such exceptions only go to prove the rule.

^k *Δευτερολογία.* Instances of an appeal for this privilege are the close of Andocides' Oration on the Mysteries, and Hypericles' Oration for Lycophron.

ing in his own case, or for a friend or relative. These ten, with two or three panegyrics, if they are genuine, and the political harangues of Andocides,¹ and Demosthenes, are the only orations in which the Attic orators actually spoke.

The practical results of this form of advocacy affect the treatment of facts by the orators in several ways. In the first place, consistency of views and statements was not indispensable. The speech-writer might support contrary principles in different causes, or he might even write for both sides in the same cause. Lysias has evidently done the former,^m Demosthenes was accused of the latter.ⁿ

Again, the orator could not give an independent statement of the case, or strengthen the statement with the direct influence of his reputation. He had to adapt the speech exactly to the character and circumstances of the speaker.^o This is the secret of the dramatic power of the orations of Lysias and Isæus. They did not cram their clients with a rhetorical statement of their case, but closely imitated what would be the natural flow of thought and emotion of the

¹ If the *Or. de Pace* is genuine. The fragmentary Olympic Oration was spoken by Lysias himself at Olympia.

^m E. g. in the *Pro Polystrato*, and *De Affect. Tyr.* he palliates oligarchy, while in his other speeches, especially *C. Eratosth.* and *C. Agoratum*, he bitterly denounces it.

ⁿ Plut. *Dem.* c. 14. Æsch. *De Fals. Leg.* § 166.

^o Quintil. *Inst. Or.* III. viii. § 50, 51. Nam sunt multæ a Græcis Latinis-que compositi orationes, quibus alii uterentur, ad quorum conditionem vitamque aptanda, quæ dicebantur, fuerunt: ideoque Lysias optime videtur in iis, quæ scribebat inductis, servasse veritatis fidem.

speakers in the circumstances in which they were placed.^p

The Athenian juries, accustomed to such a treatment of the issues brought before them, were inclined to give their verdict rather by the whole moral and æsthetic effect of the speech, than by the cogency of the arguments, or their relevancy to the rules of law under which the case was tried. The latitude of the matter in Athenian pleading, and the array of merits or of crimes brought forward to affect the minds of the jurors as to the man rather than as to the issue,^q caused many facts of historical importance to be introduced in the judicial speeches of the orators. But the worth of such facts must obviously depend on the position and the motives of the speaker, and these will have to be estimated with care, as well as the character of the writer of the speech, and of the audience to whom it was addressed.

We have thus briefly reviewed the chief causes of Attic oratory, and some of the peculiarities which resulted from them. It would be beyond our limits

^p One of the best instances is Lys. *περὶ τοῦ ἀδυνάτου*. One can see the old cripple pleading for his obol, deprecating the charge of wanton violence which his years and infirmities made a bit of comic pleasantry, and the ostentation of a lent horse, or two crutches instead of one, and appealing to Athenian feeling by dwelling on the great offices of state from which he was precluded by his pension.

^q Lysias, *C. Eratos*. § 38. οὐ γὰρ δὴ εὐδὲ τούτοις αὐτῷ προσήκει ποιεῖναι, ἵνα ἐν τῇδε τῇ πόλει εὐθιμῶν ἴσται, περὶ μὲν τὰ κατηγορημένα μηδὲν ἀπολογεῖσθαι, περὶ δὲ τῶν αὐτῶν ἵστα λίγοντες ἵσται ἱστασώμεναι, ὑμῖν ἀποδυνάστευσι ὡς στρατιῶται ἀγαθοὶ εἶναι, κ. τ. λ. The Areopagus was an exception. Cf. Arist. *Rhet.* I. i. οἱ δὲ πωλύουσι τῷ πλεονεκτησίν, καὶ ἐν τῇ Ἀρείῳ πύργῳ. Cf. Isocr. *Areop.* § 38. ἱσταδὲν εἰς τὴν Ἀρείῳ πύργῳ ἀναβῶναι, κ. τ. λ.

to discuss all the moral and intellectual influences which contributed to the warm sensibility and keen criticism of an Athenian audience. It may be well, however, to suggest in passing, that the men whom the orator had to convince and persuade in the assembly and the courts, were men who in the theatre had their sympathies quickened to the inner play of human motives, and their intellect trained to the discussion of conflicting rules of duty.

The number of Athenian orators was very considerable. They were men of every social position and every degree of ability. From among them ten were selected by the Alexandrine canon as the best representatives of Athenian eloquence. Even of these, the speeches that have been preserved are few compared with those that have been lost. As regards power and style, the orators that have come down to us were probably, in their several ways, superior to their contemporaries. But for the sake of history it is to be regretted that we have no orations of many men who took considerable part in Athenian affairs, and who are mentioned as speaking on important occasions—such as Theramenes,^r Archinus,^s Cephalus,^t Aristophon the Azenian,^u Leodamas,^v Thrasybulus the Collytian,^w

^r Cf. Lysias, *C. Erat.* and *C. Agorat.*

^s Æsch. *De Fals. Leg.* § 176, *C. Ctes.* § 195, Dein. *C. Dem.* § 76, Isocr. *C. Callim.* § 2, —as to his measures against sycophancy, Dem. *C. Timocr.* § 135.

^t Æsch. *C. Ctes.* § 194.

^u Æsch. *C. Ctes.* § 138. Dem. *De Cor.* p. 281.

^v Æsch. *C. Ctes.* § 138. *ὁὐχ ἥσσον Δημοσθένους λόγων δυνάμειος.* Dem. *C. Lept.* p. 501.

^w Lys. *C. Evand.* p. 797, § 13, seq. Æsch. *C. Ctes.* § 138.

Callistratus,* and later, Eubulus, Aristophon the Collytian,[†] Hegesippus,[‡] Polyeuctus,[§] Demades.^{||}

Antiphon is the first, in order of time, in the ten of the canon. He was at once a politician of oligarchical views and a teacher of rhetoric. His unpopularity as an opponent of the democracy was increased by the prejudice against the new practice of writing speeches for others,[¶] and, combined with a naturally reserved temper, prevented him from becoming a public speaker. The only speech he delivered in person, in his own defence, after the fall of the Four Hundred, is highly commended by Thucydides.[ⓓ] He is chiefly remarkable as the first to apply rhetoric to the practical business of public life at Athens.[ⓔ] His subtle intellect and severe taste[ⓕ] led him at once to reject the sensuous redundancy of Gorgias, fit rather for the school than for the courts, and to make exact discrimination of words, ingenious balancing of thoughts, and close reasoning on probabilities, the means of convincing his hearers.[ⓖ] As his orations throw light rather on the procedure of the criminal courts of Athens than on general history,

* Whose eloquence is said to have first kindled the ambition of Demosthenes. Cf. Demosth. *De Cor.* p. 391.

† Dem. *De Cor.* p. 250.

‡ To whom are ascribed, by some of the grammarians, the orations of [Demos.] on the Halonnesus, and on the treaty with Alexander.

§ Dein. *C. Demosth.* § 100.

|| Dein. *O. Aristog.* § 15.

¶ Plut. *X. Orat. Antiph.* § 16. *κικωμωδοῦνται δ' εἰς φιλαργυρίαν ὑπὸ ἡλιόφανος (Com.)*

ⓓ Thuc. viii. 68.

ⓔ Plut. l. c. § 4.

ⓕ Dion. Halic. *De Comp. Verb.* pp. 150, 151, Reiske.

ⓖ Plut. l. c. *ἔστι δ' ἐν ταῖς λόγοις ἀπειβήδης καὶ πείθους καὶ δυνάος περὶ τὴν ἰδέσθην, καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἀπείρους τεχνικῆς.*

it is unnecessary to consider him at greater length. But his manner of thought and expression undoubtedly had a great influence on the treatment of facts in later judicial oratory, as it probably had on the history of Thucydides. And it must be remembered that Antiphon was the first to commit speeches to writing, to which, of course, all that we learn from the Greek orators is due.

Andocides was not, like Antiphon, a professed rhetorician. His oratory was the result of a practical shrewdness and knowledge of men, and had a certain natural vigour and liveliness. But his statements are often obscure, and his arguments confused, and the subtlety, for which he has been sometimes praised,^b was probably more due to unscrupulous cunning than to real acuteness and precision.^c His speeches^d are full of information about events of importance, with which he was himself connected. But in weighing his statements, his character must always be had in view. There seems to be no reason to doubt that he was dissolute in morals, and a restless schemer, as plausible as he was faithless.^e Three times an exile, driven away or imprisoned alike by his suspicious countrymen and by the protectors whom he disgusted

^b Sluiter, *Lectiones Andocidae*, c. i.

^c Hermogenes, *De Form. Orat.* ii. p. 501. ὁ δὲ Α. πολιτικῶς μὲν εἶναι πραγματικός, οὐ μὴν πάνι γι' ἱστορηχάνι εἶναι. Cf. also *Quinct.* xii. x. § 21.

^d The Oration against Alcibiades is clearly a late rhetorical exercise. See Mr. Grote's arguments against its genuineness, which are final.

^e The Oration against Andocides ascribed to Lysias is probably spurious. It is confused and exaggerated. But the facts of his life, as stated by Andocides himself, tend to shew that its statements had foundation. Cf. also *Plut. X. Orat. Andocides*.

abroad, restored by the amnesty of Euclides, wealth and a show of moderation gave him a temporary influence, and even enabled him to repel the attack of his enemies,¹ only that his imprudence or venality on an embassy to Sparta should send him into exile for the fourth and last time. The statements of such a man must obviously be received with the greatest caution, when unsupported by proofs, or by strong probability.

Lysias, the third of the ten, was the son of a Syracusan settled at Athens.^m Joining with his brother in the colony to Thurii,ⁿ he there received a rhetorical education under the celebrated Tisias,^o while his social and political opinions were shaped by the Athenian institutions and tone of thought predominant in the town. He was driven from Thurii by the revolution that followed the destruction of the armament in Sicily, and returning to Athens, became a sophist^p and teacher of rhetoric. His school exercises of this time, if we may believe Plato,^q were in the Sicilian manner—the matter paradoxical, and the style over ornamented. With this Lysias we have fortunately nothing to do.^r The character of the Lysias whose

¹ He was acquitted on the charge about the Mysteries probably as much from the infamy and unpopularity of his accusers, Callias, &c., as from any better reason.

^m *C. Eratos*, § 4. The Cephalus of Plato's Republic.

ⁿ When fifteen years old, B.C. 443.

^o Supr. p. 11.

^p [Demosth.] *C. Neera*, p. 1351. *Λυσίας ὁ σοφιστής*.

^q Plato, *Phædrus*, p. 231, seq. Socrates contrasts him with Isocrates, to the advantage of the latter.

^r The *Λύσις ἱερῶν* composed in this style, and crowded with the most worthless historical common-places, is undoubtedly a rhetorical exercise of a later period, erroneously ascribed to him.

speeches have come down to us, as a man and as an orator, was the result of the stirring times of the Thirty Tyrants and the restoration of the democracy. It was to his personal feeling in impeaching Eratosthenes, the chief author of his brother's death,^{*} that the natural vigour and simple earnestness of his style was due, as it was to his personal connection with the great events of his time that we owe the vivid details of the oligarchic revolutions, and of the measures of the restored democracy.[†]

In his speeches the purity and grace of the style was not more remarkable than the strength and clearness of the thought. In narration he excelled. The facts were stated directly and naturally, without exaggeration. Each point in succession was brought vividly before the imagination of his hearers, and the arrangement was such as to best shew their bearing on the issue. Hence the impression produced by the matter of his orations was truthfulness.[‡]

He was personally interested in the restoration of the popular institutions, which must have its weight in the estimate of his worth as an historical authority. On the other hand, as an alien, he was debarred from public life, which alone could give the full bitterness of party feeling.

Isocrates is another instance shewing how little the

* His brother Polemarchus was executed by the tyrants. Lysias escaped, and expended the remains of his property in well-timed aid to the democrats at Phyle. Cf. Plut. *V. Lysia*, § 7. Lysias alludes to his services and their reward in the *Orat. C. Phil.* §. 29. τοὺς μεταίκοις, ὅτι, οὐ κατὰ τὸ πρόσηπον ἑαυτοῖς, ἐβούθησαν εἰς τὴν δῆμον. ἱσιμέησας ἀξίως τῆς πόλεως. Thrasybulus proposed a vote of citizenship, which failed from informality, and Lysias remained an *ισομελής*, or privileged alien.

† Dionys. Halic. *Jud. de Lysia*.

Greek orators had in common except writing speeches. He was not a statesman, though his favourite subjects were political; and he was not an advocate, though his necessities compelled him at first to write for the courts. Feeble in body and timid in disposition, he himself confessed his incapacity for public life.^u But he found an object suited to his abilities and tastes in the teaching of rhetoric, and the artistic perfection of prose writing. His pupils were men who wished to become statesmen or historians,^v and he therefore chose for his exercises the critical events of the time, illustrating them by the common-places of Greek history, and by general philosophical maxims. The purpose of his orations was, no doubt, more than temporary. His desire was to have a real influence on the destinies of Greece by the circulation of his views in the form of pamphlets. But it was mastery of style that he had most at heart.^w He devoted himself to giving a musical flow to sentences, by breaking them up into clauses harmonized by the laws of rhythm.^x In this way the central idea could be most fully expressed, while the subordinate facts were accurately balanced. Dionysius compared the poetical

^u Cf. *Ad Phil.* § 8, *Panath.* § 10.

^v Cf. Cic. *De Orat.* ii. 22. "Isocrates, magister istorum omnium, cujus e ludo, tanquam ex equo Trajano, meri principes exierunt: sed eorum partim in pompa, partim in acie illustres esse voluerunt." The two rhetorical historians Theopompus and Ephorus were pupils of Isocrates. Suidas has preserved his saying about them—"ἐν μὲν Θέσιππον χαλκίῳ δίδεσθαι, ἐν δὲ Ἐφῶρει κίνηρον." Cf. Cicero, *Ad Attic.* VI. i. 12.

^w *Panath.* § 2, 4. *Ad Phil.* § 11.

^x Cicero, *Orator. ad Brut.* c. 52. Dionys. Halic. *Jud. de Isocrate*, p. 538. Isocrates was probably guided to his peculiar style by the teaching of Thrasymachus. Cf. Arist. *Rhet.* III. viii. 4. Theramenes also influenced him. Isocrates at least was his pupil and devoted admirer. Cf. Plut. X. *Orat. Isocr.* ad init.

beauty and calm magnificence of his style to the art of Pheidias.⁷ But he allowed that the mind of Isocrates was enslaved by the cyclic rhythm of his periods.⁸ In practical matters, where exact statement and close argumentation were necessary, truth was sacrificed to finish. The treatment of facts became a constant effort to attain a unity and balance rather of artistic effect than of real connection.

At the same time, though rhetoric was his passion, Isocrates was also a sincere patriot, and a man of broad and earnest political views,⁹ in an age of short-sighted dissension among states, and selfish scheming among individuals. And though he did not enter into public life, he was intimately connected with great men of the age, as Timotheus,¹⁰ whom he accompanied on at least one of his expeditions, Jason of Pheræ, and Philip. Besides, his stay in Chios,¹¹ and his subsequent visit to the Asiatic Greeks, gave him a personal experience of much that was important in the history of his age.

Isæus interests us as the forerunner of the art of oratory as shewn in Demosthenes. He sought to

⁷ Dionys. *Judic. de Isocrate*, p. 542. 1.

⁸ Id. *ibid.*

⁹ E. g. reconciliation of the Greek states in war against Persia, and liberation of those subject or enslaved in the *Or. Paneg.* and *Or. de Pace*. Again, the suggestions of reform in *Or. Areop.*

¹⁰ *εἰς Ἀντιόχου*, § 111, 112.

¹¹ He fled to Chios after Ægospotami and there taught rhetoric. He is said to have wept at having to teach for money. (Plut. *X. Or. Isocr.* § 6.) He seems to have got bravely over these scruples, for he amassed immense wealth by his fees at Athens. Plutarch, or Pseudo-Plut., says he took nothing from fellow-citizens, and shortly after gives the story about Demosthenes being made to pay his fee!—Id. *ib.*

increase the effect of the natural simplicity and persuasive bluntness of the older manner, by more nicety of language, and artifice of arrangement. The facts were coloured for the jury by skilful preparation of their minds, and by throwing in bits of sophistry during the narration. To use the happy expression of Dionysius, Isæus played the knave with his adversary, the strategist with the jury.^d The success of this forensic style illustrates the change of tone in the Athenian audience during the second democracy—the development of the critical faculty at the expense of earnestness of purpose and practical experience.

Isocrates and Isæus, the pamphleteer and the special pleader, were succeeded by the orators of the time of Philip, who were all practical statesmen as well as rhetoricians.*

Demosthenes, universally allowed to be the greatest of Greek orators,^f is too well known, and his life is too much involved in his own historical statements, to require full discussion here. It will be enough to indicate some of the circumstances which determined the character of his oratory, and his personal connection with the facts which form the matter of his great political orations.

Thus his struggle to obtain restitution from his

^d *Jud. de Isæo.* καὶ πρὸς μὲν τοὺς ἀντιδίκους διασκευαίονταί, τοὺς δὲ δικαστὰς παρασκευαοῦν.

* Cicero (*De Opt. Gen. Orat.*) says of Isocrates, "Non in acie versatur et ferro, sed quasi rudibus ejus eludit oratio." Æschines and Demosthenes on the contrary were "gladiatorum par nobilissimum."

^f Cf. Cicero, *Orat.* c. 81. (Demosthenes) nihil Lysias subtilitate cedit, nihil argutiis et acumine Hyperidi, nihil levitate Æschini et splendore verborum.

fraudulent guardians on reaching manhood was probably a chief cause of his resolute self-reliance and practical shrewdness. Its consequences were not temporary. It brought upon him the enmity of men of wealth and political power, such as Meidias, and he was thus thrown into opposition to the leading party of Eubulus,^g while he was made to feel keenly their short-sighted selfishness, so ruinous to the interests of Athens.

Again, he entered into public life at the moment when Athens had been forced, by the imprudence of Chares, to conclude the Social war with a disgraceful peace, and when Philip had just commenced his course of perfidy and aggression at Amphipolis, and around the Thermaic gulf, and his interference in Thessalian affairs. While the general weakness of the states of Greece created in the minds of less discerning men a false impression of the balance of power, Demosthenes was almost alone in his convictions of internal weakness, and his anticipations of danger from abroad. During the first ten or twelve years of his career as a statesman, his opinions were generally met by the ridicule of the thoughtless, or the determined opposition of the corrupt. When he did convince the assembly that it was necessary to act, the sagacity with which he indicated the only efficient means, was often unable to overcome the prejudices of Athenian society, or the cumbrous machinery of legal responsibilities.^h It was the knowledge of these obstacles, as

^g Cf. *De Pace*, p. 58, *C. Meidiam*, p. 550.

^h *Olynth.* i. § 16. *Phil.* i. § 20, &c.

well as his warm patriotism, and his keen political judgment, that gave to his speeches their wonderful vigour and earnestness, and their profound exposition of the real import and connection of events. At the same time, the opposition he met with made his personal aversions, especially to Æschines, more intense perhaps than his mere disapproval of conduct or policy might have.

The general confirmation, by the events, of the accuracy and sagacity of his political judgment, would appear to give a high worth to his authority in stating the facts from which he drew his inferences. Again, although determination and study enabled him to master the impediments of a weak stammering voice, and ungraceful gestures, and to attain perfection in delivery as well as in composition, he did not, even in his best days, trust himself to speak without careful preparation.¹ His speeches were written and rewritten several times before being finally committed to memory, and the precision of language thus ensured involved also precision in the matter.

The character of Æschines, like that of his opponent Demosthenes, cannot be fully estimated without discussing the worth of what he himself has stated as to his conduct, which will be more appropriate further on. Without anticipating, then, we will only, as in the case of Demosthenes, point out some of the influences which acted upon him.

The poverty of his youth, the variety of the ways

¹ Plut. *V. Dem.* c. viii., *X. Orat. Dem.* p. 848.

in which he sought a livelihood, now as a gymnast, now as an actor of inferior parts, now as the scribe of private individuals, were not favourable for the formation of an earnest and unselfish character. The military distinction he gained at the battle of Tamynæ in Eubœa gave him at once reputation and ambition for public life, while as scribe to Aristophon the Collytian, and to Eubulus, he imbibed the principles of the political party then dominant in Athens. All these causes contributed to the personal vanity and the narrow political views which marked the whole career of Æschines. His oratorical powers were only surpassed by Demosthenes, and his energy gave him influence; but the most favourable estimate of his character was that he was an average Athenian, with the average morality of the day. That at first, at least, he was a good citizen, there is no reason to doubt; but he had neither the ardent love of Athenian freedom nor the deep insight into events and their consequences, which alone could preserve him from corruption.

The events given in his speeches are some of the most critical moments in the fall of Greece before Philip, and they are events which he describes in general as an eye-witness. But as he was combating charges of venality, his motives for self-justification and for discrediting his assailants must always be had in mind.

The other orators of this period need merely be mentioned. Their contributions to history are inconsiderable. But, in judging the worth of their statements, it is well to have in mind the incorruptibility of

Lycurgus as an administrator of finance, his severity as a social reformer, his almost superstitious regard for the nobler passages of past history, and his earnest patriotism in the present; and, in the case of Hypereides,¹ his consistent opposition to Philip and his party at Athens, outlasting the humiliation of Chœroneia,² his stainless honour,¹ and the mixture of subtlety and humour which marked his style;^m and of Deinarchus, his spiritless subservience to the power of Alexander, and his activity in assailing the last representatives of Athenian freedom.

We have so far endeavoured to constitute ourselves judges of the historical authority of the Greek orators by reviewing the sources of Greek oratory, the conditions which gave it its form, and some of the results as regards the treatment of matters of fact; and lastly by tracing the powers, characters, and circumstances of the orators themselves, so far as they bore upon their historical statements.

It is now proposed to give a brief sketch of their most important contributions to Greek history.

As has been said before, most of the speeches of the Greek orators are judicial. It might be expected, then,

¹ Some parts of the oration of Hypereides against Demosthenes, a large piece of that for Lycophron, the whole of that for Euxenippus, and nearly the whole of the Funeral Oration (over those who fell with Leosthenes in the 'Lamian War'), have been recovered in the last fifteen years by Mr. Churchill Babington (St. John's, Camb.) and Mr. Arden.

² He took an active part in inciting the Lamian War. Plut. *Phœion*, c. 23; X. *Orat. Hyp.* p. 848 E., 849 F.

¹ Id. ib. p. 848 E. *μόνος γὰρ ἔμεινεν ἀδολογημένος.*

^m Dionys. Halic. pp. 434, 643, Reiske.

that less light would be thrown by them on history itself than on the accompaniments of history—such as the forms and changes of public and private law, and the elevating or degrading influences at work in Greek society. In this way they might serve to correct or confirm the view of Greek life and manners given, half in jest half in earnest, by Aristophanes. And, in fact, much valuable information of this kind may be drawn from them. Citizenship and the frauds by which it was obtained,^a the temper of the Athenian audience,^o sycophancy and demagogy,^p the causes of the use of mercenaries and its disadvantages,^q may be instanced as some of the points most fully illustrated by them. But to give an exhaustive account of all the historical materials contained in the Greek orators would be foreign to our purpose. What we have to do is to estimate the worth of what they say as to events and connections, and it will be well to limit our sketch to these. The historical order will be followed as obviously the most convenient.

Andocides has given a vivid picture of the religious excitement at Athens after the mutilation of the Hermæ.

Peisander and Charicles, afterwards the most violent of the Four Hundred, court popularity by their severity as inquisitors,^r the Senate have extraordinary powers,^s reward after reward is proclaimed. Meanwhile the fleet

^a Cf. the cases of Agoratus and Nicomachus in *Lysias* and *Isocr. De Pace*, § 50, 88.

^o And. *De Pace*, § 30; *Dem. F. L.* § 136; *De Chers.* § 34.

^p *Lys. Pro Polyst.*, *De Affect. Tyr.*, *C. Ergocl.*; *Isocr. De Pace*, § 126, 36, 57.

^q *Isocr. Paneg.* § 158, *De Pace*, § 24, 44-48, and esp. *Dem. Phil. I.* p. 46.

^r *De Myst.* § 36.

^s *Id.* § 15.

for Sicily is ready, the ship of Lamachus under weigh, and the last assembly is being held for the generals, when Pythionicus rises and charges Alcibiades with profanation of the mysteries.[†] Informations quickly follow. At last comes the daring fabrication of Diocleides.[‡] Peisander moves the suspension of the rule forbidding citizens to be tortured, and the senators Mantitheus and Aphepsion, denounced in open session, only escape the rack by flying to the altar as suppliants.[¶] The generals are summoned, the citizens are assembled in arms in the city, in the Long Walls and in Peiræus—the trumpet summons the knights to the Anaceum, the senate sleep armed in the Acropolis, the Prytanes at the Rotunda—alarms are raised of Bœotian forces hovering on the frontier.[¶] No one is safe, informers extort hush-money from their victims and then denounce them^{*}—the meeting of the senate is each day the signal for men to hurry from the public places.[¶] Such is the reign of terror that Andocides describes and claims to have put an end to by his own information.

The history of the Four Hundred may be supplemented from Lysias.

Phrynichus and Peisander he selects as instances to prove that revolutionary sentiments proceed from individual interests, not from party principles.^{*} Both were demagogues, and made revolution the means to escape the penalties of their crimes. As to Phrynichus, we learn that he was reared in poverty among the

[†] *De Myst.* § 11.

[‡] *Id.* § 37, seqq.

[¶] *Id.* § 43, 44.

^{*} *Id.* § 45.

^{*} *Id.* § 40, 41.

[¶] *Id.* § 36 ad fin.

^{*} *De Affect. Tyr.* § 8, 9.

herds in the country, and afterwards led a precarious life as a sycophant in the city.^a Contrasted with Phrynichus is the honest Eupatrid, Polystratus, educated in the city, living on his estates,^b refusing to join in the treachery of his fellow officers at Oropus,^c holding aloof from the Four Hundred till eight days before their fall,^d and then only taking office to enrol nine thousand instead of five thousand on the list of citizens,^e and to do his duty gallantly in the battle off Eretria.^f Lysias bitterly assails the conduct of Theramenes. That Peisander and Callæschrus took the lead was a sufficient motive to make him encourage the discontent of the people and join the party of Aristocrates, and his faithlessness was consummated in the destruction of his closest friends, Antiphon and Archeptolemus.^g

Andocides has preserved the decree of Demophantus, passed after the fall of the Four Hundred, denouncing subverters of the democracy in the future, and offering rewards to their slayers.^h The decree was appealed to by Lycurgus, as still existing inscribed on a pillar in front of the Senate chamber.ⁱ

Much may be gathered from Lysias as to the treatment of the oligarchs,^j and as to the prevalence of

^a *Pro Polystr.* § 11, 12. The words *ἵνα ἐξίστημι τῷ δημοσίῳ*, shew that he was sometimes *fined* for failure in his charges.

^b *Pro Polystr.* § 10-13.

^c *Id.* § 6.

^d *Id.* § 10, 14.

^e *Id.* § 13.

^f *Id.* § 7.

^g *C. Eratos.* § 65, 67.

^h *Andoc. De Myst.* § 96-99.

ⁱ *C. Leocr.* § 124, 125. He says, *μετὰ τοῖς ἐπιδόκουνται*. That it followed the deposition of the Four Hundred and not that of the Thirty is plain from *Andoc. De Myst.*, l. c. § 99. *διὰ τοῦτο γιγνέσθαι ἔκρυψεν ὅτι τοῖς νόμοις διὰ χρεῖσθαι ἀπ' Ἐπικλιδῶ ἄρχοντας*.

^j E. g. confiscation of lands of Peisander, *περὶ σάκου*, § 4. Also *Pro Polystr.* pass.

sycophancy and official dishonesty in the next few years.^k

That the Athenian fleet was lost at Ægospotami through treachery was a common-place of the orators. According to Demosthenes, Conon charged Adeimantus with the guilt.^l The first measure to meet the overwhelming calamity was a general amnesty, proposed by Patrocleides. It has been preserved by Andocides,^m whose specifications of the different classes of disfranchised persons are exceedingly valuable.ⁿ The decrees of disability were expunged, and a general oath of reconciliation exchanged in the Acropolis.^o

Two speeches of Lysias, against Eratosthenes, and against Agoratus, the former spoken directly after the restoration of the democracy, the latter a few years later, give much information as to the siege of Athens, and the period of the Thirty Tyrants.

Sparta demands the demolition of ten stades of the Long Walls. The demagogue Cleophon protests on behalf of all.^p Theramenes soothes the assembly by promising to obtain peace for Athens without loss of ships or walls,^q if they will send him with full powers to Sparta. By the bait of some "other unrevealed advantage,"^r he carries his point, though he will not disclose the means he hopes to use, and in spite of the

^k *De Affect. Tyr.* § 25, seq.

^l Dem. *De Fals. Leg.* p. 401. Lysias includes Alcibiades (the elder) in the charge. *C. Alcib. A.* § 37, 38. Cf. *Pro Bonis Aristoph.* § 52.

^m *De Myst.* § 77.

ⁿ *Id.* § 73.

^o *Id.* § 76.

^p *Lys. C. Agorat.* § 8. ^q *C. Erat.* § 68.

^r *Id. ib.* φάσκω πρῶγμα ἐργάσασθαι μίαν. So *C. Agor.* § 9. εἶπετο δὲ καὶ ἄλλοι τι ἄγαθόν παρὰ Λακκιδαιμονίῳ τῇ πόλει ἐργάσασθαι.

opposition of the Areopagus.^a He protracts his stay at Lacedæmon till Athens was despairing enough for any terms.^b Meanwhile Cleophon charges the senate with conspiracy,^c and with reason, for most of its members afterwards went into the notorious senate under the Thirty.^d The fellow-schemers of Theramenes now determine to clear the way for the revolution.^e Satyrus, afterwards prominent under the Thirty, brings Cleophon to trial before a dicastery.^f But his condemnation is ensured by prevailing on Nicomachus, then entrusted with the revision of the laws, to produce a decree, presumably forged, authorizing the senate to be joint jurors.^g The return of Theramenes with the fatal terms, by which the whole Long Walls, the fortifications of Peiræus, and the ships, were sacrificed, calls forth the violent indignation of the popular leaders and officials, Strombichides, Dionysodorus, &c.^h A ready tool is found by the oligarchs in the sycophantⁱ Agoratus, son of a slave of two masters,^j brother of spies, kidnappers, footpads.^k A cooked conspiracy, a sham seizure, a pretended resistance, the nature of which is shewn by his refusal to fly from Athens, are used to give credit to his evidence.^l Before the senate, and afterwards before the assembly, he denounces the generals, and other popular men, putting his own bail in the list.^m Menestratus, one of the denounced, is persuaded to imitate Agoratus, and

^a *C. Erat.* § 69, ad init.

^b *C. Nicom.* § 10.

^c *C. Nicom.* § 10, 11.

^d *C. Agor.* § 13, 14; *C. Erat.* § 70.

^e *Id.* § 64.

^f *Id.* § 67.

^g *C. Erat.* § 70, *C. Agor.* § 11.

^h *C. Agor.* § 20.

ⁱ *Id.* § 7.

^j *Id.* *ib.*

^k *C. Agor.* § 65.

^l *Id.* § 20-30.

^m *Ib.* *id.*

to save himself by adding new names to the list.^f Two subject allies, Hippias of Thasos, and Xenophon of Icarus,^g and an Athenian, Aristophanes, died on the rack in preference.^h The surrender of Athens follows,ⁱ and the appointment, by the aristocratic clubs, of the Ephors—among them Critias and Eratosthenes.^j The democracy still remained.^k Theramenes deferred his final stroke till the concerted arrival of Lysander from Samos.^l The assembly to discuss the future form of government is at last held in the presence of the Spartan commanders, and with the Spartan forces at hand.^m Theramenes, emboldened by such support, and backed by the threats of Lysander,ⁿ moves that a board of thirty be entrusted with supreme power, and mocks at the murmur of disapproval.^o Ten are named by Theramenes, ten by the Ephors, ten chosen from those who remained to vote for the disgrace of their country.^p All was arranged beforehand. This graphic account of the establishment of the tyrants is given by Lysias as part of the defence of Theramenes himself^q before the senate, when he was brought to his death, not by his love of the people, but by his own villany.^r

Those denounced by Agoratus and his fellows are then brought before that senate, where none was tried

^f *C. Agor.* § 55, seq.

^g *Id.* § 52.

^h *Id.* § 58.

ⁱ *C. Eratos.* § 43. *ἰσχυρὰ ἡ ναυμαχία καὶ ἡ συμφορὰ τῇ πρὸς τοὺς ἰσχυροὺς δημοκρατίας*
ἔτι εὐθης, κ. τ. λ.

^j *Id.* l. c.

^k *Id.* l. c.

^l *C. Erat.* § 71.

^m *Id.* § 73.

ⁿ *Id.* § 74.

^o *Id.* l. c.

^p *Id.* § 75.

^q *Id.* § 77.

^r *Id.* § 78. *ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ἄποκαίνιστος Θεραμένης ἀλλ' ὅτι τῆς αὐτοῦ πορνείας.*

and acquitted.^a In the chairs of the Prytanes sit the tyrants. Instead of the urns and the ballot, the votes are cast openly on tables in reversed order, under the eye of the Thirty.^d

Their first profession of purging the city of evil-doers,^e the cruelty and rapacity of their attack on the wealthy aliens,^f the terrorism that prevented daughters from being given in marriage,^g and relatives from attending the funerals of the victims of proscription,^h the massacre at Salamis, and again at Eleusis, where a single vote condemned three hundred citizens to death,ⁱ the support given to the Thirty by the knights,^j are all contributions of Lysias to history. That the Thirty made adherents by forcing citizens to participate in their guilt and its odium, and that Lysander had a hand in the proscriptions, we learn from an early forensic oration of Isocrates.^k

The return of Thrasybulus and the exiles was worn threadbare by all the orators. There are some points of importance given by Lysias. After the skirmish in Peiræus, ten men of the more moderate party—among them Pheidon and Eratosthenes—were put in power instead of the Thirty, with the view to a compromise.^l So far from reconciliation, the Ten make war on both, borrow a hundred talents from Sparta, and get a mercenary army with Lysander to command

^a *C. Agor.* § 38.

^d *Id.* § 37.

^e *C. Erat.* § 5.

^f *C. Erat.* § 6, seqq.

^g *Id.* § 21.

^h *C. Agor.* § 87.

ⁱ *C. Erat.* § 52.

^j *Pro Mantitheo.* Mantitheus wishes to prove that he was not a knight under the Thirty. The oration is one of Lysias' greatest successes in Ethopoeia.

^k *Isocr. C. Callim.* § 16, 17.

^l *Lys. C. Erat.* § 53-57.

it.^c The restoration of the liberties of Athens was mainly due to the moderation of the Spartan king Pausanias. Lysias tells how the heart of the king was moved by the entreaties of Diognetus, brother of the great Nicias, who, with the infant grandson and the young nephews of Nicias, met him as a suppliant in the Academia.^d

Andocides, whose aim in the oration on the Mysteries is to shew that even if he were guilty his case is covered by the amnesties of Euclides' archonship, gives much interesting information as to the oaths taken by the people at large, the senate, and the Heliastic courts, and he has also preserved the motion of Tisamenus for the revision of the laws, and the supplementary enactments.^e

There is a fragmentary speech of Lysias belonging to this period, in opposition to the motion of a certain Phormisius, one of the returned exiles, that the franchise should be restricted to landholders. Lysias urges the necessity of free institutions to ensure an earnestly patriotic body of hoplites.^f

Light is also thrown by the orators on the miserable state of Athens at this time. Docks and arsenals which had cost the city more than a thousand talents were sold by the Thirty to be pulled down for three talents^g and were now in ruins;^h there were no funds to pay the hundred talents to Sparta, which the people took

^c *C. Erat.* § 59.

^d *De Bonis Nic. Fratris*, § 10-12.

^e *De Myst.* § 81, seq.

^f Lysias mentions incidentally in this speech that Argos was about as strong as Athens in hoplites, while Mantinea had not even three thousand.

^g *Isocr. Areopag.* § 66.

^h *Lys. C. Nicom.* § 22.

upon themselves, nor even a petty debt of two talents to the Bœotians.¹

Such is a rapid summary of the more important points in what may be called the period of Andocides and Lysias. The next fifty years, down to the Social war, are much less fully illustrated, and the orator who illustrates them is Isocrates. The great epochs of this period—the expedition of Cyrus, the campaigns of Agesilaus in Asia, the victories of Epaminondas—are slightly alluded to, if at all.

In contrasting the claims of Athens and of Sparta to the headship of Greece, Isocrates describes in general terms the atrocities of the Lacedæmonian dominion—decarchies with helots for harmosts, traitors rioting in murder and outrage, wholesale butchery without trial.^j In recommending peace at the time of the Social war,^k he says that dominion corrupted Sparta sooner than it did Athens, producing a reckless injustice and lawless cupidity, which was the source of faction and massacre and undying enmities among the subject states.¹ The instance he gives is more important. At Chios, the warm ally of Sparta during the Peloponnesian war, they sent the leading men into exile, while they appropriated the fleet.^m

In a highly coloured panegyric written for his son Nicocles, Isocrates relates how Evagoras, of Æacid lineage,ⁿ and endowed with the free energy and refined taste of a Greek, overthrew the Phœnician

¹ Isocr. *Areop.* § 68; Dem. *C. Lept.* p. 460, § 12.

^j Isocr. *Panegy.* § 110-113. Cf. *Panath.* § 54.

^k *De Pace*, § 95, 96.

^m *Id.* § 98.

ⁿ About B.C. 356.

^o *Evag.* § 12-19.

tyrant at Salamis,^o how he introduced into semi-barbarized Cyprus the arts and manners of Greece, built a powerful navy, conquered most of the island,^p and how, at the ruin of the maritime empire of Athens, many Greeks of distinction flocked for refuge to Salamis—among them Conon, fresh from Ægospotami.^q Conon marries in Cyprus,^r and becomes the devoted friend of Evagoras.^s Both are enemies to Sparta. They seize the opportunity of the continual disasters of the Persian satraps on land, to urge renewal of war by sea. Evagoras serves in person, and contributes most of the fleet; and, with Conon in command, the maritime power of Sparta is destroyed in the battle of Cnidus.^t The subsequent cruises of Conon, and the rebuilding of the Long Walls, are only alluded to.^u A pillar with the inscription, “For delivering the allies of Athens,” and a bronze statue (an almost unprecedented honour) were awarded to him by his grateful countrymen.^v

The aid given by Athens to the Thebans at the time of the battle of Haliartus is eloquently praised by Demosthenes,^w and Lysias’ simple soldier Mantitheus in making the most of himself gives some minor particulars of interest in the Corinthian war.^x The oration of Andocides on the Peace gives a tolerably clear estimate

^o Isocr. *Evag.* § 22, 23.

^p Id. § 47-50.

^q Id. § 51, 52.

^r Lys. *De Bonis Aristoph.* § 39.

^s Isocr. *Evag.* § 53.

^t Id. l. c. § 53-59. Cf. Andocidem, *De Pace*, § 22.

^u Isocr. *Panegy.* § 119; *Ad. Phil.* 61-64, 67; Lys. *De Bonis Aristoph.* § 12.

^v Demosth. *C. Lept.* § 68-72.

^w Demosth. *De Corona*, p. 258.

^x *Pro Mantith.* § 13-16. Going to Haliartus he served on foot, though most were anxious to serve as cavalry from fear of the Spartan infantry. At the battle of Corinth “he retired *after* the haughty Steirian (Thrasybulus), who reproached everybody with cowardice.”

of the position and policy of the great Greek states in the fourth year of the war.⁷

The conduct of Thrasybulus on his last expedition to the coast of Asia, immediately before the peace of Antalcidas, is placed in an unfavourable light by an oration of Lysias.⁸

The real character of the peace of Antalcidas, and its consequences to the Greek race, are stated with power and feeling by Isocrates in his Panegyric oration. Ambassadors sent by Greeks have made a peace for barbarians.⁹ The towns freed by its terms look to the great king as their deliverer;¹⁰ and while by the sacrifice of the Asiatic Greeks¹¹ he divides the world with Zeus,¹² in the pillars inscribed with this ordinance rather than convention,¹³ and placed in the temples of Greece, he has a nobler trophy than any victory.¹⁴ The guilt lies with Sparta.¹⁵ Warring against Athens with the plea of universal liberty, she has only caused the revolt of the Ionians from Athens to betray them, in violation of their wishes and their rights, to the barbarians who plunder them for tribute, fill their strongholds with lawless troops, and, worst of all, subject Greek freemen to personal contumely that no Greek master would use to his slaves.¹⁶ Some have their cities razed to the ground,¹⁷ others are hurried off, without pay,¹⁸ or inclina-

⁷ Cf. And. *De Pace*, § 12, 14, 19, 20, 24, 27.

⁸ Lys. *C. Ergoclem*, § 4, 5, 8, 12, 17.

⁹ *Panegy.* § 177, 178.

¹⁰ Id. § 175.

¹¹ Id. *ai Indidapinas*, § 175.

¹² Id. § 179. Cf. the boast of Xerxes—Herodotus, vii. 8.

¹³ Id. § 176. *πρὸς τὰ ἱερὰ, κ.τ.λ.*

¹⁴ Id. § 180.

¹⁵ Id. § 125.

¹⁶ Id. § 122, 123.

¹⁷ Id. § 136, 137.

¹⁸ Id. § 153, 142, *ad fin.*

tion, to serve against their own countrymen or their best friends.^k

We have sacrificed our own honour,^l our fellow Greeks,^m and our allies, the rebels against Persia, as Cyprus,ⁿ for a peace in which pirates infest the seas, hireling targeteers hold the towns, civil war rages within the walls,^o while incessant revolutions and universal insecurity multiply the exiles;^p for a peace, in which so far from autonomy being attained, some cities are under tyrants, others under harmosts, others in the hands of barbarians, others utterly destroyed.

With regard to the revival of the Athenian confederacy, the information given by the orators is much slighter than might be expected or wished.

That the claims of the cleruchs were at first disavowed,^q and that the obnoxious word 'tribute' was exchanged for 'contribution,'^r that fleets under Timotheus and Callistratus,^s and under Chabrias, freed the islands in the Ægean from harmosts and brought them, some by force, some by persuasion, into alliance with Athens,^t and that the victory of Chabrias off Naxos made Athens again mistress of the seas,^u is as much as we can draw from them.

The subsequent campaigns of Timotheus, the number of cities he brought into the power of Athens, his successes, especially at Corcyra and Samos, the slight

^k Isocr. *Panegy.* § 123, 124.

^l Id. § 176.

^m Id. § 135.

ⁿ Id. § 172.

^o Id. § 115, 116.

^p Id. § 116, 168.

^q Id. *Or. Plat.* § 44.

^r Id.

^s Æschines, *De Fals. Leg.* p. 283.

^t Isocr. *Or. Plat.* § 18.

^u Demosth. *C. Lept.* p. 480.

cost of his movements to the state, are discussed with warm admiration by Isocrates.^v There is an interesting oration of Demosthenes for his friend Apollodorus, son of the banker Pasion, against Timotheus, which seems to shew his expeditions involved him in much pecuniary embarrassment. The most interesting facts given in it are that Jason of Pherœ, and Alcetas the Epirot prince, came in person to Athens to use their influence on his impeachment for delay in preparing the second expedition to Corcyra.^w He is also represented as receiving a present of timber from Amyntas,^x which reminds us of the spars that Andocides received from Archelaus and sent to the Athenian armament at Samos, according to his own statement.^y

Much light is thrown by the Archidamus of Isocrates on the political results of the foundation of Messene—the intensity of Spartan feeling, and the lukewarmness of their allies after the defeat of Leuctra.

But the interest of Athens, in the last period covered by the orators, lay in her efforts to recover and keep the Chersonese, Amphipolis, and the towns around the Thermaic Gulf, and in her resistance to the growing power of Philip.

Iphicrates, at the beginning of his three years' campaign on the coasts of Macedonia, found Amyntas and his son Alexander just dead,^z and Eurydice with difficulty maintaining herself and her young sons Perdiccas

^v Isocr. *De Perm.* § 107, seqq. Cf. Dem. *C. Arist.* p. 666; *De Rhod. Lib.* p. 193.

^w Id. *C. Timoth.* § 22. This oration is by some thought spurious.

^x Id. § 27.

^y *De Reditu.*

^z Demosth. *De Fals. Leg.* p. 402. He had been assassinated.

and Philip against the activity of the pretender Pausanias. Summoning Iphicrates, Eurydice made a touching appeal to him, placing the future conqueror of Greece on his knee. He was prevailed upon to drive out Pausanias, but the regent Ptolemy Alorites ungratefully thwarts the views of Athens at Amphipolis.*

Timotheus replaces Iphicrates, and the mercenary leader Charidemus, who had been in the pay of Iphicrates, at once surrendered to the Amphipolitans the hostages with which he was entrusted by that commander, and deserts first to Cotys, and then deserts Cotys to take the pay of Olynthus. The straits of Athenian commanders for troops are amusingly illustrated by Timotheus catching Charidemus on his second desertion, and making him serve against Olynthus, for which he is profusely thanked by Athens!^b

Timotheus takes Torone and Potidæa, thus effectually humbling Olynthus;^c but failing as to Amphipolis, he transfers the war to the Chersonese;^d while Charidemus passes into the Troad to aid Artabazus, and using his opportunity, seizes Ilium and other towns for himself.^e In this he incurs the wrath of the Persians, and after invoking the aid of Athens with lofty promises, abandons his principality and again takes service with Cotys, the greatest enemy of Athens

* Æschines, *De Fals. Leg.* § 27-29. ^b Demosth. *C. Aristocr.* pp. 669, 670.

^c Isocr. *De Permut.* § 108, 113; Deinarch. *C. Demosth.* § 14.

^d Demosth. *C. Aristocr.* p. 670, § 158, ad init. ^e Id. ib. p. 671.

at that time.^f Timotheus was followed by a succession of incompetent generals: Ergophilus failing in the Chersonese;^g Callisthenes against Amphipolis, who had to fight Perdiccas as well;^h Autocles indiscreet enough to carry out the decree of the people against Miltocythes, who had revolted from Cotys and appealed in vain to Athens, and tried at home for the performance of his orders!ⁱ Cephisodotus, who, having to deal with the versatile Charidemus, was forced to a disastrous convention, in which Cardia was abandoned to Charidemus himself.^j The first use the adventurer made of his possession was to get the inhabitants to murder the unfortunate Miltocythes under circumstances of revolting cruelty.^k The balance of power and interests between Cersobleptes, son and successor of Cotys, and the other two Thracian chiefs, Amadocus and Berisades, who also have Greek generals serving under them, and connected by marriage relations,^l brings about an arrangement by which the Chersonese is relinquished to Athens, and which is confirmed by the arrival of Chares with a large force.^m An interesting contrast of Greek and Barbarian feeling is given in the repugnance of the Thracians to murder Miltocythes,ⁿ and in the honours bestowed on the assassins of Cotys by Athens.^o

At the time of the revolt of Miltocythes, and the

^f Demosth. *C. Aristocr.* p. 672.

^g Demosth. *De Fals. Leg.* p. 398.

^h Æschines, *De Fals. Leg.* pp. 214, 215.

ⁱ Dem. *C. Aristocr.* p. 672.

^j Id. p. 674.

^k Id. p. 677.

^l Id. pp. 623, 624.

^m Demosth. *C. Aristocr.* p. 678.

ⁿ Id. p. 677.

^o Id. pp. 660, 662, &c.

appeal from Proconnesus for aid against Cyzicus,^p we learn that Alexander of Phæræ, ungrateful for the aid sent to him by Athens against Pelopidas,^q sends out squadrons to ravage the islands of the Ægean, and even enslaves Tenos.

The wrong inflicted on Athens by Themison and Theodorus at Oropus,^r was followed, eight years later, by an attempt on the part of Thebes to reduce Eubœa.^s Demosthenes quotes the words of Timotheus in the assembly held at this emergency. "Are you deliberating here, when the Thebans are in the island? Will you not cover the sea with triremes? Will you not spring from your seats, hurry to Peiræus, and launch the fleet with your own hands?"^t The ships, thanks to the good naval administration of the year, were new and sound.^u In five days, says Æschines,^v a fleet and land force arrived in Eubœa, and, aided by Chares and his mercenaries,^w beat and drove out the Thebans within thirty days.^x

That the Social war was instigated by the Carian prince Mausolus,^y that he established oligarchies in Rhodes and Cos, and even occupied them with his troops,^z and that the chief motive of the Byzantines to

^p Demosth. *C. Polycl.* p. 1207; *De Cor. Trierarch.* p. 1230.

^q *C. Aristocr.* p. 660.

^r Dem. *De Cor.* p. 259, § 99.

^s *De Cor.* l. c.; *De Chers.* p. 108.

^t *De Chers.* p. 108, § 74,

^u *C. Androt.* p. 597, § 14.

^v *ἄρ' οὐν ταῦτ' ἐπράξαν' αἱ εὐταὶ δίκαι, εἰ μὴ ναῦς ὥχισται παντός, ἐν αἷσι βουθέσαντες.*

^w *C. Ctesiph.* p. 479, § 85, seq.

^x Dem. *C. Aristocr.* p. 678, § 173.

^y The truce was proposed by Diocles. Dem. *C. Meid.* p. 670.

^z *De Rhod. Lib.* p. 191, § 3. *ὁ μὲν προτεταγμένος ταῦτα καὶ πρίσας Μαύσωλος.*

^a Id. pp. 195, 198; *De Pace.* p. 63, § 28.

join Chios and Rhodes in the revolt was to have the tolls of the Bosphorus,^a are facts given in Demosthenes' oration for the Rhodians, and elsewhere.

The disaster to the armament, for which apparently Chares was to blame, was turned by him and the orator Aristophon^b into a charge of corruption and treachery against his colleagues Iphicrates and Timotheus. Iphicrates took the responsibility on himself but was acquitted. Timotheus was condemned to the unprecedented fine of a hundred talents.^c The haughty arrogance^d of Timotheus told against him, while Iphicrates was popular from his good sense and studied moderation.^e

On his accession, among other difficulties, Philip had to meet the pretender Argæus, supported by Athens. Defeating him, he liberated the Athenians captured along with him, and professed a desire to renew the friendly relations of his father Amyntas to Athens.^f

The successive captures of Amphipolis, Pydna, Potidæa, and Methone are only alluded to by Demosthenes.^g From him, however, we learn that Amphipolis was attacked after the Athenian success in Eubœa; that Hierax and Stratocles came as ambassadors from Amphipolis to Athens to beg her assistance; that aid was refused from a belief in Philip's statement, that he was besieging Amphipolis to place it in the hands

^a Demosth. *De Pace*, p. 63; *C. Lept.* p. 475. ^b Deinarch. *C. Phil.* § 17.

^c Isocr. *De Permut.* § 129.

^d Id. ib. § 130, 131.

^e Dem. *C. Meid.* p. 534, 535.

^f Id. *C. Aristocr.* p. 660.

^g *Olynth.* I. pp. 11, 12; *Phil.* I. p. 41; *De Cor.* p. 248, &c.

of Athens;^h that, again, the advances of Olynthus are refused for the secret treaty as to the exchange of Pydna for Amphipolis;ⁱ that the Athenians are amused long enough for Philip to obtain Pydna by betrayal,^j and capture Potidæa, after a protracted and costly siege.^k Aid from Athens is, as usual, behind time,^l the Athenian cleruchs are driven out, and Olynthus is conciliated by the present of Potidæa.^m The Athenians are too late at Methone,ⁿ and too remiss to succour Pagasæ.^o Flattering the Thessalian wish to have the Pylæa celebrated under their superintendence,^p Philip attempts to seize Thermopylæ, which it was important for Athens that the Phocians should hold. Frequent allusions are made to the prompt and efficient defence of the pass by Athens—an expedition which involved the heavy cost to the state of two hundred talents, besides the expenses of individuals.^q

Demosthenes now recognizes that Athens cannot cope with Philip in the field.^r Philip had gathered about him a picked staff of officers,^s and had added the Thessalian revenues to those of Macedonia.^t He had

^h Demosth. *C. Aristocr.* p. 659, § 116. Φίλισσας, ὅτι μὲν Ἀμφίπολιν ἐπελοχευεῖ, τοῦ ἑμῶν παρεδῶν πολιορκεῖν ἴφην, ἰσχυρὰ δ' ἔλαβεν, καὶ Πोटιδαιαν ἀποσπασίλευσε Cf. also *De Hal.* p. 83. σὴν δ' ἐπιστολῆς, κ. τ. λ.

ⁱ *Olynth.* II. p. 19, § 6. ἐπὶ θρυλούμενόν ποτι ἀπώρρητον.

^j *C. Lept.* p. 476. οἱ προδόντες τὴν Πύδναν ἰπασθίντες καὶ παρ' ἡμεῶν δωρεαῖς. Also *Olynth.* I. p. 10, § 5. Πύδναιον τοὺς ἀποδιξαμένους.

^k *C. Aristocr.* p. 656, § 107.

^l *Olynth.* I. p. 11, § 9.

^m *Phil.* II. p. 71, § 20; *Halonn.* p. 79, § 10.

ⁿ *Phil.* I. p. 50; *Olynth.* I. p. 11.

^o *Id.* II. cc.

^p *De Pace*, p. 62; *Phil.* II. p. 71.

^q *De Fals. Leg.* pp. 367, 466.

^r *Phil.* I. p. 52 ... ἥδη ὑπὲρ τοῦ μὴ παθεῖν κακῶς ὑπὸ Φίλισσας.

^s *Olynth.* II. p. 23.

^t *Olynth.* I. p. 15.

secured Pagasæ by fortifications in Magnesia,^u and had got ships enough together to make descents and captures at Lemnos and Imbros, to surprise the corn fleet at Geræstus, and to burn a sacred trireme in the bay of Marathon itself!^v

Then come his successes in Thrace,^w the siege of Heræon Teichos,^x the decree of forty triremes, citizens to serve in person, and sixty talents to be contributed, all which comes to nothing when Philip's illness is reported.^y

The first Philippic, besides the military plans suggested by Demosthenes, contains a vivid statement of the true causes of the disastrous state of affairs—the backwardness of individuals resulting in general inefficiency to meet the restless energy of Philip.^z The movements of Athens were like the awkwardness of a barbarian in boxing, following the blow of his adversary. All civil duties were exactly arranged beforehand. But when war came nothing was ready: trierarchs had to be appointed, claims and counter-claims had to be adjudicated, special funds to be provided, crews to be changed and changed back again, now aliens, now citizens—meanwhile the opportunity for action was lost. Then there was the want of pay.^a Generals did not die fighting honourably against the enemy, but as felons at home. They had to retain

^u Demosth. *Olynth.* I. c.; II. p. 21. ^v *Phil.* I. p. 46. ^w *Olynth.* I. p. 13.

^x *Olynth.* III. p. 29.

^y Id. ib.

^z *Phil.* I. p. 40, 41, 51. Demosthenes declaims vigorously against *το βουθίαις καλμαῖν*.

^a *Phil.* I. p. 46, 47.

advocates in Athens—their soldiers were spies abroad and jurors at home.^b

The aggrandisement of Philip by the conquest of Thessaly caused Olynthus to look to alliance with Athens for safety.^c His recovery from illness was immediately followed by an attack on Olynthus and Chalcidice.^d

Olynthus had more than doubled her power since her war with Sparta, in which her spirited resistance ended in a peace on her own terms. But now she had a Lasthenes roofing his house with Macedonian rafters, an Euthykrates driving his herds on Macedonian pastures—a competition for the half-disguised bribes of Philip, amid general admiration of the successful. And so, with a thousand horse and ten thousand foot-soldiers, with neighbours for allies, with fifty triremes, ten thousand mercenaries, and, best of all, four thousand citizens from Athens, place after place yielded, troops were surrendered by their generals, and at last general ruin was consummated. Such is the general statement of the causes of the subjection of Chalcidice, given by Demosthenes six years after.^e The three Olynthiac orations vividly present the political situations during the first year of the Olynthian war, but give none of the events.^f

In the midst of the Olynthian war, hostilities were

^b Demosth. *Phil.* I. p. 46, 47.

^c *C. Aristocr.* p. 656.

^d *Olynth.* I. p. 13. *σίδος ἐπεχρίσιν*.

^e *De Fals. Leg.* pp. 425, 426.

^f Cf. Grote's *Hist. of Greece*, VIII. (second edition), p. 82, note, and the appendix on the order of the Olynthiacs, which seems to settle the question as nearly as the paucity of facts in the three orations admits.

brought about in Eubœa by the intrigues of Philip.^g Plutarch of Eretria, a friend of Meidias, and as the event proved a traitor to Athens, sent for Athenian succour.^h Demosthenes, venturing to oppose, was nearly torn to pieces by the party of Meidias.ⁱ An armament was voted, and there was a great display of personal liberality in fitting it out.^j Callias and his brother Taurosthenes of Chalcis led the resistance to Athens in Eubœa, the former obtaining aid from Philip, and the latter mercenaries from Phocis. Out-numbered and outmanœuvred, the Athenian commander was forced to give battle near the racecourse of Tamynæ. Though Plutarch deserted at the first moment, the Athenians gained a brilliant victory. It was here that Æschines gained his military glory, and it is from him that we obtain this sketch of the campaign.^k

Philip at last lays before the Olynthians the alternative that either they must leave their city or he must leave Macedonia.^l Olynthus and her one-and-thirty allied towns are utterly obliterated,^m their territories made the means of bribing fresh victims,ⁿ while the traitors, now useless, are consigned to merited disgrace.^o The mournful fate of the enslaved Olynthians is touchingly illustrated by the meeting of Æschines, coming from the Peloponnese, with Atrestidas an

^g Demosth. *Phil.* I. p. 51. The letters of Philip to the Eubœans were read to the assembly, but have not been preserved in Demosthenes' speech.

^h *C. Meid.* p. 550.

^j *De Pace*, § 58.

ⁱ *C. Meid.* pp. 566, 567.

^k *Æsch. C. Ctesph.* § 86, 87.

^l *Dem. Phil.* III. p. 113, § 11.

^m *Id.* p. 117.

ⁿ *Dem. De Fals. Leg.* p. 386. Bribery of Æschines and Philocrates.

^o *De Chers.* p. 99.

Arcadian leading a train of thirty Olynthian captives, all women or children.^p

All the circumstances of the peace concluded with Philip in the succeeding year are given most fully in the two orations of Demosthenes and Æschines on the Embassy.

Citizens of Athens had been captured in Olynthus,^q while Chares, the defender of the state, was roaming with his armament no one knew where.^r Æschines, sent as ambassador to the Peloponnese, by the proposition of Eubulus,^s combated the orators in the interest of Philip, as Hieronymus at Megalopolis, without avail.^t The desire for peace was increased by the reports of Phrynon and Ctesiphon on returning from Macedon.^u

Then we have the motion of Philocrates that Philip might send envoys for peace, his defence by Demosthenes,^v and, after the fall of Olynthus, the desire of Philip for peace is expressed through the actor Aristodemus, who was sent informally to negotiate the release of Iatrocles and the captives.^w The failure of the active efforts for an alliance with Thebes,^x the rejection by the Phocian Phalæcus of Athenian aid for the defence of Thermopylæ,^y contributed still more to the final decision, again on the motion of Philocrates, to send ten envoys to treat with Philip.^z The details of this first embassy, his own speech on the question

^p Dem. *De Fals. Leg.* p. 439.

^r Æsch. *ib.* p. 37.

^s Dem. *ib.* pp. 344, 438; Æsch. *ib.* p. 38, Step.

^t Æsch. *ib.* p. 29, § 12.

^u Id. *ib.*

^v Id. *De Fals. Leg.* p. 30, 31.

^q Æsch. *De Fals. Leg.* p. 80, Step.

^r Dem. *ib.* p. 434, 438, 439.

^s Id. *ib.* p. 30, § 14.

^t Id. *C. Ctes.* p. 73, Step. § 138, seq.

^u Dem. *ib.* p. 442.

of Amphipolis, the failure of Demosthenes, and the graceful hospitality of Philip, are recounted at length by Æschines.* Demosthenes is nearly silent on the subject.

It is not within our present limits to give an exhaustive statement of the history that is involved in the counter-speeches of Æschines and Demosthenes. We may allude to the graphic description given by Æschines of his denunciation of the Amphissians before the Amphictyonic assembly; to the effect produced at Athens by the news that Philip was at Elatea, as related by Demosthenes; to the touching account of the mourning and misery in the city after Chæroneia, as told by Lycurgus; and to the confused account given by Deinarchus of the affair of Harpalus and the conduct of Demosthenes as to the treasure.

The sketch that has been here attempted of the information given by the Attic orators on the more important points of Greek history with which they were connected, is necessarily imperfect. But it may be sufficient to shew the real importance of estimating their authority in historical matters, and to indicate some of the conditions under which their statements of fact are or are not trustworthy.

First of all, it is clear from an examination of the orators, that the time of orations, in relation to the events stated in them, is a most important condition of their historical authority. In the case of remote events, the statements of the Greek orators are generally so

* Dem. *De Fals. Leg.* p. 31, § 20, seq. p. 34.

inaccurate as to be practically worthless. Thus Andocides represents the adherents of the Peisistratids as punished with death, exile, or disabilities, and as being covered by an amnesty when the first Persian invasion was threatened; whereas it is certain that the invasion was instigated by Hippias himself and his adherents. Besides, he confuses the two Persian wars.^b Again, Andocides and after him Æschines speak of Miltiades son of Cimon (!) as recalled from the Chersonese and employed to conclude a five years' truce with Sparta, at the time of the Eubœan war.^c Besides the more obvious error, it is certain such a peace could only have been made at a time eight years before the revolt of Eubœa. In the same speech of Andocides the order of the Eubœan and Æginetan wars is inverted,^d the Long Walls (two instead of three, as stated by Thucydides,) are represented as built after the five years' truce, and the Southern Long Wall is actually referred to the period after the conclusion of the thirty years' truce!^e The statement^f that his great-grandfather Leogoras was in command in a victorious battle against the Peisistratids at Pallenum (!) is more than an inaccuracy, and he is not even consistent in his story.^g

Again, the effect of national pride in falsifying or

^b Andoc. *De Myst.* § 107, 108.

^c Andoc. *De Pace*, § 3. Æschines, *De Fals. Leg.* p. 51. The correspondence between the speech of Andocides and the passages referred to in Æschines led Taylor to consider the former a rhetorical exercise composed after Æschines, and some of its errors seem incredible in a man of the time of the Peloponnesian War: e.g. the two Long Walls.

^d And. *De Pace*, § 3, § 6.

^e Id. § 7.

^f *De Myst.* § 106.

^g He says, ἡ τοῦ πατρὸς ἀνδρομανίας. *De Reditu.* § 26. Cf. Herod. V. 64; VI. 121.

exaggerating remote events is evident in the orators. Thus Isocrates speaks of the Halys as the limit assigned to Persia on land by the reputed peace of Callias.^b Æschines says that the terms offered by Sparta to Athens after Ægospotami were that she should retain Lemnos, Imbros, and Scyros, and her democracy.^c And he boasts that Athens sent out the Sicilian expedition after Deceleia was fortified.^d So, too, Sparta is represented by Isocrates as sending ambassadors after the battle of Cnidus to surrender to Athens the rule over the seas.^e Deinarchus makes the Athenians, after an open vote, at the proposition of the orator Cephælus, march to Thebes and free the Cadmeia from the Spartans;^f and Demosthenes speaks of Athens as the only power which rescued the Phocians and secured Thermopylæ, when Philip first threatened the pass;^g while, in a similar manner, national hatred finds expression in the statement that Thebes alone proposed that the Athenians should be enslaved after the surrender.^h

Again, the use of historical parallels for rhetorical effect causes inaccuracies. In this respect Isocrates is a frequent offender against historical truth. A most striking instance is his contrast of Thermopylæ and Artemisium. A thousand Lacedæmonians, with allies to help them, fight (with bravery, he allows,) and are beaten by the land force of the Persians. The Athenians, unaided, man sixty triremes against the whole Persian

^b Isocr. *Areop.* § 80. ἡμεῖς ἂν ἄλλως.

^c Æschines, *De Fals. Leg.* l. c.

^d Deinarch, *C. Demosth.* § 38, 39.

^e Isocr. *Plataic.* § 31.

^f Æsch. *De Fals. Leg.* p. 38, Step. § 76.

^g Isocr. *Areop.* § 65.

^h Dem. *De Fals. Leg.* p. 443.

fleet, and are victorious.* The violence done to the facts is too obvious to require discussion. Another case is the contrast drawn by Demosthenes between the wars of Olynthus against Sparta and against Philip, where the weakness of Olynthus and the defeat of the Spartan commanders are exaggerated, and the success of Sparta is disguised.†

In the case of more recent events, accuracy of statement is generally in proportion to the intervening time. Speaking of the fall of Potidæa, Demosthenes, in an oration three years after the event,‡ refers it to the efforts of Philip himself, while three or four years after, he represents Philip as merely aiding the Olynthians to reduce the town.⁴ Similarly, in the oration on the Crown, sixteen years after the peace, the Thebans are represented as having been desirous of alliance with Athens,⁵ before the advances of Philip were made which led to the peace; while it is clear, from his earlier statements and from Æschines, that the advances of Athens were at that time repelled by Thebes.⁶ In the case, however, of events less complicated than the intrigues of the times of Philip, and more distinctly and

* Isocr. *Panegy.* § 91-3. That the Lacedæmonians were one thousand in number is confirmed by Xenophon (*Hell.* VI. iv. 15). But the three hundred Spartans who bore the attack of the myriads of Xerxes are ignored, as also the withdrawal of the allies. Besides, the Athenian *division alone*, at Artemisium numbered one hundred and twenty-seven triremes according to Herodotus, and one hundred and forty according to Diodorus, and Isocrates ignores the other divisions, in order to pretend an equality between the forces at Thermopylæ and at Artemisium. Note also *αὐτὸς ἐπὶ πρῶτον*, as compared with *αὐτὸς ἄρτι ἐπὶ ταυρινόν*.

† Dem. *De Fals. Leg.* p. 425.

‡ C. *Aristocr.* p. 656.

⁴ *Olynth.* ii. § 14. The Macedonian power, *ἐν μὲν ἀποστήσαντος μίσην ἔχει εἰς αὐτὸν*.

⁵ *De Cor.* p. 231.

⁶ Cf. *supra.* p. 49.

strongly impressed on the memories of the audience, such differences of statement are very slight. Thus the speech of Lysias against Agoratus, in relating the same events, is remarkably consistent with that against Eratosthenes, though the latter directly followed the restoration of the democracy, while the former was delivered some years later." Mr. Grote^v thinks that Lysias misdates the accusation of the generals by Agoratus, in placing it before the surrender. But the order of events given by Lysias is in itself most probable; and so gross an error would only have damaged his case, when the jurors were perfectly acquainted with the facts, and seem to have been by no means unanimous against the accused. Again, Lysias would probably have connected the conduct of Agoratus with the Ephors if the impeachment followed the surrender. The difficulty of shipping off Agoratus to Megara during the siege was not so great, as it is clear from a contemporary judicial oration of Isocrates that corn-ships broke the blockade at this time.^w

Another important consideration in estimating the statements of the orators is the presence or absence of personal motives. Where the speaker wished to justify himself, or to place an enemy in an odious light, the facts naturally suffered. Thus the interest that Andocides had in clearing himself from imputations as to the mutilation of the Hermæ, makes his account of his own information and of its results very

^u πολλὰ καὶ ἐν ὁμοίᾳ. § 83.

^v *Hist. of Greece*, vol. v. (second edition) p. 559, note.

^w *Isocr. C. Callim.* p. 382.

doubtful.* He denies having impeached himself, which Thucydides on the contrary affirms; and he states that none of those denounced by him were put to death,⁷ which is highly improbable.* The perversions of history that result from the recriminations of political enemies may be abundantly illustrated from the speeches of Demosthenes and Æschines, on the Embassy, and on the Crown.

To take some of the more remarkable examples. Demosthenes, in relating the circumstances under which the report of the first embassy was given, makes Æschines say that, in his speech before Philip, he had omitted all mention of Amphipolis,^a which is refuted by all the probabilities of the case. Æschines speaks of Demosthenes as bitterly assailing his colleagues, when the report of the first embassy is being made, and his words are falsified by his own statement in the later oration.^b

But inaccuracies from this source were not confined to facts in the conduct of the speakers. Thus Demosthenes, in reproaching Æschines with a speech before the assembly, advising that Athens should decide for herself only, points the reproof with the fact that envoys from other Greek states were present,^c while

* Andoc. *De Myst.* § 48, seq.

⁷ Id. § 53. *οἱ οὖν ζῶσι καὶ ἀπετιληλόθασιν.*

* Thucydides (VI. 60) says, *ταῖς μὲν ἀπίστουσι, κ. τ. λ.* But many of those denounced by Andocides had already been denounced by Teucer, and put to death or exiled.

De Myst. § 52. But cf. Plut. *Vit. Alcib.* p. 201, A, B.

^a Dem. *De Fals. Leg.* p. 421. Cf. Æsch. *De Fals. Leg.* pp. 33, 34, Step.

^b Compare *De Fals. Leg.* p. 35, Step., with *C. Ctes.* p. 62, Step., where he says, *ταῦτὰ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἐρίεβουσιν ἀπαγγεῖλαι.*

^c *De Fals. Leg.* p. 340.

he defends himself from Æschines' charge against him of hurrying on the peace, by the assertion that the apathy of the Greeks had been thoroughly exposed, and that, far from envoys from other states being present, there were no Athenian envoys abroad whose return could be expected.^d

So, too, from one statement of Æschines, it would seem that peace had been hurried on, without waiting for the assembly of numerous envoys from the Greek states, in conjunction with whom Athens might have made her own terms;^e from another, that all hope of assistance from the rest of Greece was shewn to be groundless, by the failure of the Athenian envoys.^f

The common-places of past history are the natural field of rhetorical exaggeration. But even as to contemporary events inaccuracies were produced by the study of effect, and by an audience critical rather of style than of matter.

For instance, Isocrates greatly overstates the successes of Agesilaus and the other Lacedæmonian commanders in Asia.^g In reviewing the ruinous consequences to the Greek world of the defeat of Athens at Ægospotami, he mentions among them the fleet of barbarians ravaging the coast of the Peloponnese, and capturing Cythera and other islands,^h ignoring, for the sake of effect—we will not call it argument—that Conon was in command, and did infinite good to Athens at any rate.ⁱ This may be met by his equally gross mis-

^d Dem. *De Cor.* p. 233. * Æsch. *C. Ctes.* pp. 63, 64, Step.; *De Fals. Leg.* p. 36, Step.

^e Æsch. *De Fals. Leg.* p. 38, Step. ^f Isocr. *Or. Panegy.* § 143, 144.

^h Isocr. *Or. Panegy.* § 119.

ⁱ Cf. *Ad. Phil.* (much later.)

representation, in the encomium of Evagoras, that Conon by his victory at Cnidus raised Athens to the fulness of her former power, and restored her empire over the allies,¹ whereas the second confederacy came sixteen years later.²

These general conditions may be employed to eliminate what is probably inaccurate or misrepresented in the statements of the orators. They will, accordingly, be the negative tests of their authority. The only positive ground for believing the orators in matters of fact is the probability that, within these limits, they will be truthful in what they say. They had to convince, and falsehood or carelessness of statement does not generally convince. The degree of this probability will obviously depend on the known character of the speaker, on the purpose of the speech, and lastly and especially, on the critical requirements of the audience.

It remains to indicate briefly the importance of the orators in relation to the history of Greece. Their statements are naturally confined to events in which Athens or Athenians are concerned. Down to the wars with Philip, they throw little light on the more important events of general Greek history. Political situations are sometimes vividly given.¹ But the allusions to facts are scanty. And in the earlier

¹ Isocr. *Evag.* 52-57.

² There are some striking instances of rhetorical exaggeration of contemporary events in the oration for the Plataeans: e. g. the offers of the Theban revolutionists to Sparta.

¹ As in the *Panegyric* (after the Peace of Antalcidas) and *Archidamus* (after the battle of Leuctra) of Isocrates.

period the history of Athens is hardly of general interest. The centres of Greek life during that time were Sparta and Thebes. Still the full details given by the orators of the internal events of Athens at some of her most critical moments are of great value. They complete the scanty information of contemporary historians, and afford more ample materials for judging the strength and weakness of Athenian institutions. In the time of Philip, all the interest of Greek history is gathered around the decisions and the movements of Athens. And for this period, the orators are the best authorities, as they were the chief actors in the events they describe. Again, it is only for the earlier period that we have contemporary historians. Thucydides was the contemporary of Andocides, Xenophon of Lysias. To compare the authority of Andocides with that of Thucydides would be absurd. But the statements of Lysias may often be preferred with reason to those of Xenophon, who delights to present the country he had abandoned in an odious or despicable light.^m A single point may be taken to illustrate their comparative value. Lysias has given a clear and consistent account of the intrigues by which the popular leader Cleophon was brought to a mock trial and put to death.ⁿ Xenophon speaks of Cleophon as having perished in a sedition some time before the events with which Lysias connects him.

For the later period, the histories of the contempo-

^m Cf. Xenophon's account of the siege of Athens with the speeches of Lysias. *C. Erat.* and *C. Agorat.*

ⁿ Cf. *supra*, p. 32.

Now Ready, Price Six Shillings, Cloth Gilt,

THE
MYSTERIES OF ISIS;
OR, THE
College Life of Paul Romaine.
A STORY OF OXFORD.

Opinions of the Press.

"The author of this work, in the form of a novel, brings before us a variety of characters, with whose specialties every Oxford man is familiar. The plot is a good one throughout, and the interest in the incidents is not marred by the unpardonable exaggerations which generally characterise productions of this kind. The hero, Paul Romaine, is a remarkably happy illustration of what a young man, with even limited means, may effect in this University, if he exercise only ordinary prudence, energy, and self-command. Apart from the experiences of Paul Romaine, which are admirably drawn out, the author is rich in his expression and conclusions." It is "a work which must command an extensive circulation."—*Oxford University Herald*, May 12th, 1866.

"Stories of Oxford life have been so common of late that we picked up this book with no slight misgivings, but the perusal of a few pages convinced us that whatever may be the author's shortcomings in other respects, he had an advantage over many persons who write about Oxford, inasmuch as he really does know something of University life, and is qualified by observation and experience for the performance of his self-imposed task of describing 'some scenes of Oxford life and character as they really are; not as they might be supposed to be by the imaginations of fanciful non-University writers.' The writer tells us in the preface that 'most of the events narrated in the volume are strictly true,' and that 'he has purposely sacrificed all details of plot to the scenes in Oxford.' The result is as might be expected. To the ordinary novel reader, who looks for a constant succession of strange incidents and startling surprises, the book will be rather disappointing; but in place of these we have animated descriptions of University Life in its various phases, including the College Wine Party, Town and Gown Rows, the Examinations, both 'Small' and 'Great,' Boating, Cricketing, the Commemoration, &c. The hero, Paul Romaine, who is described as a 'large-made man, over six feet high, with a great broad chest, and sinewy arms,' comes to Oxford with a scholarship at St. Chrysostom's College, passes through the incidents more or less common to an undergraduate career, obtains a Fellowship, and settles down as one of the drones of the University. The book, however, as we have intimated, is chiefly interesting for its graphic pictures and sketches of college life."—*Oxford Chronicle*, May 26th, 1866.

"The book is moral in tone, lively in dialogue, true to Oxford nature, rife with good (and bad) quotations, and successively pathetic and amusing."—*Oxford Undergraduates' Journal*.

OXFORD: T. & G. SHRIMPTON, and all Booksellers.